

State Policies on Assessment Participation and Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Martha L. Thurlow, Sheryl S. Lazarus, Sandra J. Thompson, and Amanda Blount Morse
University of Minnesota

State assessment systems continue to evolve as federal requirements change and more students are included in the assessment systems. An examination of states' participation and accommodations policies in place at the beginning of the accountability requirements set by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 revealed that policies for both participation and accommodations were becoming more specific in comparison to previous years. Additional participation options beyond the usual three (participation without accommodations, participation with accommodations, alternate assessment) were more evident in state policies, and states continued to increase the number of accommodations included in their policies. Some states allowed accommodations for all students regardless of whether they received special education services. The most controversial accommodations continued to be read aloud, calculator, and scribe. Changes in state policies, differences among current policies, and implications of these policies are discussed.

In recent years, all 50 states have embarked on education initiatives focused on increased accountability for improved student performance. The logic behind these efforts has been to find a way to measure student success in achieving challenging academic standards and to hold schools accountable for the results. Statewide assessment has become a common way to hold schools accountable for improving education outcomes for all students. Statewide assessment results help policymakers make decisions to improve education programs.

History

In the past, students with disabilities were excluded from statewide assessment systems for a variety of reasons (Elliott, Erickson, Thurlow, & Shriner, 2000; Elliott, Thurlow, Ysseldyke, & Erickson, 1997; Huebert & Hauser, 1999; McGrew, Thurlow, & Spiegel, 1993). As states increased their reliance on accountability systems to improve education outcomes, however, this exclusion created a source of concern: Students with disabilities might not receive benefits from resulting reforms. This concern was an important factor in federal legislation mandating the inclusion of students with disabilities in statewide assessment systems.

abilities in statewide assessments, to offer accommodations where appropriate, to report the number of students with disabilities participating in the assessments, and to report the performance of these students with the same frequency and in the same detail that all students' performance levels are reported. According to the law, states are also required to develop alternate means of assessment for those students who are unable to participate in standard assessments and to report the performance of these students.

The 2001 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, No Child Left Behind (NCLB), reconfirmed the federal government's commitment to including students with disabilities in state accountability systems (Thurlow, 2002). The reauthorization requires all students to be assessed in reading and mathematics in Grades 3 through 8 by 2005-2006, with science assessments to be added in 2007-2008. It also calls for disaggregation of data for minority students, limited-English-proficient students, and students with disabilities. Furthermore, NCLB reinforces prior federal requirements for reasonable accommodations to ensure full assessment participation. NCLB also recognizes that students with significant cognitive disabilities may need alternate assessments to participate in formal accountability and assessment systems (Thurlow, 2002).

Legal Requirements

In 1997 the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was amended to require states to include students with dis-

Background Information

Interest in the policies that determine the participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessments has increased

as states have worked to bring their assessment practices and policies into compliance with these laws. The inclusion of students with disabilities in statewide assessment systems, as required by law, is considered essential (McDonnell, McLaughlin, & Morrison, 1997) to improving education opportunities for these students and to providing meaningful and valuable information about student performance to schools and communities. Tracking state policies concerning the participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessment and the provision of accommodations and monitoring changes in these policies over time is important. The National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) has tracked information on state participation and accommodation policies for students with disabilities since 1990, with the most recent analysis examining 2001 policies (Thurlow, Lazarus, Thompson, & Robey, 2002). Each time NCEO has examined states' policies (Thurlow, House, Boys, Scott, & Ysseldyke, 2000; Thurlow, Scott, & Ysseldyke, 1995a, 1995b; Thurlow, Seyfarth, Scott, & Ysseldyke, 1997; Thurlow, Ysseldyke, & Silverstein, 1993), the policies have changed significantly from the time before.

In the early years, the changes were most often reflected in increases in the number of states with written participation and accommodation policies. By the end of the 1990s, all states had policies in place, but changes continued. Most of these changes reflected alterations in the specifics of participation criteria or in the accommodations listed as appropriate or not appropriate for students to use in state testing. These types of changes are expected to continue as small adjustments are made in response to both in-state (e.g., implementation of a new assessment) and federal (e.g., nonapproval of state assessment systems by Title I) factors.

Purpose

This study was conducted to examine the state participation and accommodation policies in place in 2001, at the beginning of the No Child Left Behind accountability requirements. This study, however, goes beyond noting these policies and tracking any changes since 1999, when the last analysis was conducted. The scope of this study was extended to include an analysis of the implications of the policies for several broader issues. Specifically, the study examined how decisions are made about whether students receive accommodations and which groups of students (e.g., students with Individualized Education Programs [IEPs], students with 504 plans, English language learners, all students) are eligible for accommodations.

Method

To obtain the information used in the current analysis of states' written participation and accommodation policies, all 50 states were contacted during the summer of 2001 and asked for copies of policies on the participation of students with dis-

abilities in statewide assessments and the provision of accommodations that had been revised since 1999. All 50 states responded to our request. Forty-five states sent revisions, and five states noted that no changes in their participation or accommodation policies had been made since 1999.

After all state policies were collected and analyzed, the results of our analysis were sent to officials from each state to review and recommend changes if needed. State officials could indicate that no changes were needed, request more information to decide whether the tables were accurate, or make changes to the tables. States were asked to submit written documentation of any changes that needed to be made. New changes or revisions were accepted through October 31, 2001 (see Thurlow et al., 2002, for a complete list of documents received).

In this analysis, policy information is summarized. Although this makes the information easily accessible, it can obscure the underlying complexity of the individual state policies. For example, the variation in length of the documents describing each state's policies, which ranged from a few pages to a few hundred pages, is not apparent. This format also makes it difficult to discern the variation in specificity of the documents. Some states specify accommodations for each individual test, whereas others provide general accommodation guidelines that apply to all tests administered in the state. Some of these complexities can be distinguished in this article, but others are only evident by looking at the actual documents from the states.

Results

The results of this study are divided into two sections. The first section presents the results of the participation policy analysis, and the second section presents the results of the accommodation policy analysis.

Participation Policies

In 2001, as in 1999, all states had a state-level participation policy for students with disabilities in state or district testing. These were examined for their decision-making criteria and the availability of additional testing options.

Decision-Making Criteria. Table 1 summarizes the variables most frequently mentioned in the state participation policies. The policy variables are classified according to whether they are allowed without restrictions, allowed with restrictions, prohibited, or not mentioned in determining how students participate in statewide assessment. The primary variables used without restrictions in determining how students participate in assessments were course content or curricular validity, parent involvement, and nonpursuit of standard diploma or the general curriculum. All but one state indicated that the IEP team's decision was a primary factor considered in

TABLE 1. Summary of Participation Policy Variables

Policy variable	Used without restrictions	Used with restrictions	Prohibited	Not mentioned
IEP team decides	49	0	0	1
Nature/category of disability	5	0	22	23
Course content or curricular validity	27	1	0	22
Parent/guardian involvement specified	20	5	1	24
Receiving special education services/% of time	1	0	10	39
Nonpursuit of standard diploma or general curriculum	12	1	0	37
Student emotional anxiety	3	3	0	44
Other	24	9	3	14

determining whether a student would participate in the statewide assessment. Few states imposed restrictions on the policy variables included in Table 1. States did, however, prohibit the use of some variables. The variables most often prohibited were the nature or category of a student's disability and the percentage of time that a student receives special education services.

Among the changes to the policies from 1999 to 2000, *student emotional anxiety* has been added to several state participation policies as a criterion to determine student participation in assessment. Six states permitted the assessment participation decision to be based, in whole or part, on a student's emotional anxiety and the student's possible adverse reaction to the testing situation.

Tremendous diversity exists in the criteria that states use to make decisions about participation in statewide assessment. This diversity is reflected in the *Other* category. The criteria in this category ranged from requiring certification of a medical condition to requesting exclusion for religious beliefs. The most frequently noted "other" criterion referred to performance considerations, with most states indicating that poor performance is not an acceptable reason for exclusion from the assessment. Still, two states did indicate that performance levels might determine which testing option is most appropriate. The second most frequently mentioned criterion in this category was related to extended absence. Seven states had policies that did not permit exclusion because of excessive absence, whereas two states permitted exclusion for absence. Another frequently mentioned criterion was the location of the student (e.g., students not at their home school, in treatment facilities, in hospitals). Six states disallow decisions based on social, cultural, or economic differences.

In comparing the 1999 and 2001 criteria listed in state policies to determine the participation of students with disabilities in state assessments, several changes were evident (see Table 2). Most notably, the number of state policies that

explicitly prohibited the use of the nature or category of a student's disability in the assessment participation decision-making process increased from 11 to 22. Moreover, analysis of state policies in 2001 indicated that more states considered whether the student received instruction in the course or content areas covered by the assessment when making participation decisions than did so in 1999. In 2001, 28 states had policies that allowed participation decisions to be based at least partially on whether students received instruction in the course or content areas covered by the assessment. In 1999, only 15 states had policies that listed course content as a factor to determine participation of students with disabilities in state tests.

The number of states requiring parental involvement in the assessment participation decision-making process was also greater in 2001 than in 1999. Twenty-five states addressed the role of the parent or guardian in the decision-making process, whereas in 1999 only nine states required parental involvement. The number of state policies allowing participation decisions to be based wholly or partially on the amount of time students received special education services decreased from four states in 1999 to only one state in 2001. The number of states disallowing the consideration of this variable has risen from only 6 states in 1999 to 10 states in 2001.

Additional Testing Options. Some state participation policies mentioned additional testing options for students with disabilities, namely out-of-level testing, partial participation, and alternate assessment. *Out-of-level testing* indicates that a student may take an assessment designated for a lower grade level than the grade in which he or she is placed to receive instruction. Only five states had written policies that indicated that out-of-level testing was permitted without any limitations, and 12 states had policies permitting out-of-level testing with the stipulation that these test scores not be aggregated.

Comparing state participation policies from 2001 to those from 1999 indicates that several changes occurred in written

TABLE 2. Changes in the Number of State Participation Policies That Include Various Variables, 1999 to 2001

Participation policy variable	Policy variable specification	States with variable in policy	
		1999	2001
Nature/category of disability	State policy explicitly <i>prohibits</i> the use of the nature or category of a student's disability in the assessment participation decision-making process.	11	22
Course content or curricular validity	State policy <i>allows</i> participation decisions to be based at least partially on whether the student received instruction in the course or content areas covered by the assessment.	15	28
Parent/guardian involvement specified	State policy <i>requires</i> parent involvement in the assessment participation decision-making process.	9	25
Receiving special education services/% of time	State policy <i>allows</i> participation decisions to be based wholly or partially on the amount of time students receive special education services.	4	1
	State policy <i>prohibits</i> participation decisions from being based on the amount of time students receive special education services	6	10
Student emotional anxiety	State policy <i>allows</i> the assessment participation decision to be based, in whole or part, on a student's emotional anxiety and the student's possible adverse reaction to the testing situation.	3	6
	State policy <i>prohibits</i> the assessment participation decision to be based, in whole or part, on a student's emotional anxiety and the student's possible adverse reaction to the testing situation.	0	3

policies on out-of-level testing. In 2001, written policies in 21 states indicated that out-of-level testing was available in some form for one or more tests, whereas only nine states had written policies that indicated that out-of-level testing was an option in 1999. Many of these policies had caveats, however, the most common being that out-of-level test scores not be included in the aggregate scores of the student population. The use of out-of-level testing has decreased because NCLB requires assessment against grade-level academic standards.

Partial participation means that some students with disabilities may take certain parts of the assessment without being required to take the entire assessment. The student takes subtests of an assessment or only those parts that cover specific content areas. Partial participation was the most frequently mentioned option in states' 2001 participation policies. The written policies in 21 states indicated that partial participation was allowed; four states disallowed the practice. The number of states permitting partial participation remained almost the same from 1999 to 2001, with only one fewer state allowing this option in 2001 compared to 1999.

Alternate assessments are assessments designed for a subgroup of students. Alternate assessments are most commonly used to enable pupils with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are unable to access the state assessment even with accommodations to participate in the accountability system. The use of alternate assessments is a recent development,

and states are using a variety of alternate assessment approaches to assess students with severe cognitive disabilities, including a portfolio approach that provides gathered evidence to demonstrate performance, performance assessments that directly measure student skills or knowledge, teacher-completed checklists of student skills, and IEP-based reviews (Quenemoen, Thompson, & Thurlow, 2003). Though controversial, a few states have alternate assessments that look very similar to out-of-level tests. Some states provide grade-level alternate assessments for students who have not passed a graduation exam or other statewide test (Krentz, Thurlow, Shyyan, & Scott, 2004). All states now indicate that an alternate assessment is available (Thompson & Thurlow, 2001); thus, policies indicating the availability of multiple alternate assessment options were examined. The written policies in nine states indicated that more than one alternate assessment was available.

Accommodation Policies

In this analysis, *accommodation* is used to indicate any change or adjustment to standard testing procedures or materials. Accommodations are those changes intended to enable a student with a disability to participate in state or district assessments or to enable the student to better demonstrate knowledge and skills. We examined terminology for *okay* and

not okay accommodations, eligible groups, decision-making criteria, and accommodations frequently mentioned in state policy.

“Okay” and “Not Okay” Accommodations. In most state policies ($n = 41$), a variety of terms were used to distinguish between test changes that produced scores considered to be comparable to other scores and those test changes that produced scores deemed not comparable to other scores. Two sets of terms were used by many states to distinguish between accommodations that produced “okay” scores and those that did not. Fifteen states used the term “accommodation” for changes that were not considered to change the test construct and “modification” for changes that were considered to change what was being tested to an extent that it invalidated a student’s score. Seventeen states used the terms “allowed accommodations” and “not allowed accommodations,” and six states used the terms “standard accommodations” and “nonstandard accommodations.”

Most states aggregated (e.g., included) the scores of assessment participants using accommodations for accountability purposes and in the computation of scores included in summary reports. Fifteen states’ policies, however, made references to what transpires when certain test changes are implemented. For example, some states indicated that scores were removed from summary reports (11 states), flagged or marked (2 states), or reported as zero or placed in the lowest performance category (2 states). Eleven states alluded to a distinction in the treatment of accommodations. For example, Colorado and Wyoming indicated that the use of certain accommodations must be documented but the use of other accommodations did not need to be documented.

Eligible Groups. Accommodation policies also specify the groups of students considered eligible for accommodations. They may apply to students with IEPs, students with 504 plans, students with limited English proficiency, or all students. Although most states’ policies indicated that accommodations were for students with IEPs or 504 plans, some states had policies that applied to all students or to a broader group of students than just those receiving special education services. For instance, New York allowed accommodations for students who formerly received special education services. Of the 15 states that did not limit the provision of accommodations to students with IEPs or 504 plans, five (Colorado, Kansas, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Wyoming) specifically indicated that assessment accommodations were available to all students.

Decision-Making Criteria. Criteria for making decisions about accommodations were included in the majority of the accommodation policies reviewed. States cited a variety of criteria to guide decision-making, such as variables that must be considered and variables that may not be considered when making decisions about accommodations. Thirty-nine

states indicated that the use of instructional accommodations must be considered in making decisions. Twenty-four states required that the decision-making body consider whether the accommodation produced an unfair advantage or maintained the validity of the assessment. A handful of states specifically prohibited basing decisions about accommodations on the program setting in which the student received instruction (six states) or the student’s disability category (eight states).

Additionally, some states required that an accommodation be used for a minimum period of time before it could be used in formal assessments. For example, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, and Wyoming required an accommodation to be used for at least 3 months in instruction prior to use on a statewide test. Several states also indicated that a state-level person or group must decide on the use of certain accommodations.

In comparing the criteria used in 2001 to the criteria used in 1999, few changes were evident. The number of states specifically indicating that an accommodation must maintain validity or not provide an unfair advantage rose from 16 in 1999 to 24 in 2001. In both 1999 and 2001, no states permitted the use of program setting or disability category in the determination of accommodations use, and several states specifically prohibited the use of those criteria.

Accommodations Frequently Mentioned in State Policies. The accommodations that states most often allowed, both with and without restrictions, as well as the accommodations that states most often prohibited, are included in Table 3. The accommodations that state policies allowed for students with disabilities can be categorized as:

1. presentation accommodations (including Braille, read aloud, reading/re-reading/clarification of directions, and sign interpretation);
2. equipment and materials accommodations (including amplification equipment, audio-/video-cassettes, calculators, and magnification equipment);
3. response accommodations (including the use of computers, scribes, spell checkers, and writing in the test booklet);
4. scheduling and timing accommodations (including extended time, testing over multiple days, testing at a time beneficial to the student, and the use of breaks); and
5. setting accommodations (including individual administration, separate rooms, small-group administration, and administration in a student’s home).

Braille, proctor/scribe, write-in test booklet, and test administration in a small group were the most frequently mentioned accommodations in state policies.

Although some accommodations are accepted by states as accommodations that should be available to all students with-

TABLE 3. Accommodations Frequently Allowed and Prohibited

Accommodation	Number of states			
	Allowed without restrictions	Allowed with restrictions	Completely prohibited	Not mentioned
Presentation				
Braille	35	14	0	1
Read aloud	5	41	1	3
Read/reread/clarify directions	29	10	1	10
Sign interpretation	37	8	0	5
Equipment and materials				
Amplification equipment	34	0	0	16
Audio-/videocassette	16	9	2	23
Calculator	14	23	1	12
Magnification equipment	40	0	0	10
Response				
Computer or typewriter ^a	30	9	1	10
Proctor/scribe	31	17	0	2
Spell checker/assistance	7	9	11	23
Write in test booklet	37	2	0	2
Scheduling/timing				
Extended time	26	16	3	5
Over multiple days	19	6	2	23
Time beneficial to student	35	0	0	15
With breaks	33	10	0	7
Setting				
Individual administration	46	1	0	3
Separate room	36	0	0	14
Small group	46	2	0	2
Student's home	12	6	1	31

^aOften the policy contains instructions about disabling spellcheckers.

out any restrictions, other accommodations are allowed only under certain circumstances or are considered nonstandard accommodations, resulting in a score that is not aggregated with other scores. For example, the read-aloud accommodation was allowed by five states for all their tests under all conditions. Forty-one states allowed the read-aloud accommodation only for certain tests or under certain conditions. Twelve states allowed all or part of tests to be read aloud but did not aggregate the scores of students who used this accommodation. Most often, states allowed a math test to be read aloud but did not allow the use of the read-aloud accommodation on a test that assessed reading skills.

Many states also imposed restrictions on the use of calculators during assessments. The calculator accommodation was mentioned in the policies of 37 states, but more often than not, the scores were not aggregated when this accommodation was used, or it was allowed only in limited situations (23 states). Proctor/scribe was allowed with restrictions by 17 states, extended time by 16 states, and Braille by 14 states.

Eleven states specifically prohibited the use of a spell-checking device, but it was allowed with or without restrictions by 16 states (7 without restrictions and 9 with restrictions).

Although not as frequently prohibited as the use of a spell-checking device, extended time, multiple days, and audio-/videocassette accommodations were also prohibited by more than one state.

States' overall accommodation policies remained relatively stable from 1999 to 2001, although in general each accommodation was mentioned by more states in 2001 than in 1999. The biggest changes were evident in the clarifications and specifications attached to specific accommodations. For example, the content areas in which accommodations could be used or the specific grades in which an accommodation was considered appropriate were listed. Generally, more clarification was provided about the use of spell checkers, calculators, and audio-/videocassettes than for other accommodations.

Discussion and Policy Implications

State participation and accommodation policies, intended to facilitate the participation of students with disabilities in state and district assessments, have continued to evolve in recent years in response to recent legislation (e.g., No Child Left Be-

hind, the IDEA Amendments of 1997). Several changes in state participation and accommodation policies have important policy implications for the participation of students with disabilities in state and district assessments.

Role of Accommodations in Accountability Systems

Both NCLB and IDEA recognize a need for the appropriate use of instructional and assessment accommodations to enable some students with disabilities to access large-scale tests. According to the State Accountability for All Students Project (2003) at the University of Dayton, the use of accommodations has dramatically increased the participation rates of students with disabilities in statewide testing. As states assemble the components of inclusive assessment systems, "the inter-relationships among the components—participation, accommodation, alternate assessment, reporting, and accountability policies—must be considered carefully, along with the intended and unintended consequences of various relationships" (Lehr & Thurlow, 2003, p. 5).

Need for High-Quality Alternate Assessments

Policymakers across the United States have grappled with how to measure appropriately the academic achievement of students with significant cognitive disabilities, and states have developed a wide variety of alternate assessments. Researchers, educators, policymakers, and other stakeholders must debate and discuss the assumptions underlying the alternate assessments. The process is an "important activity that helps a state develop an alternate assessment that reflects its educational values for students with significant cognitive disabilities" (Quenemoen et al., 2003, p. 43).

Policymakers also need to consider thoughtfully what is the appropriate role of alternate assessments. Some states have developed alternate assessments that are very similar to out-of-level tests for students unable to pass the state exit exam or other statewide assessment. Thurlow, Minnema, Bielinski, and Guven (2003) found wide variability in the extent to which students were tested out of level, suggesting that states that make extensive use of out-of-level testing may reflect issues of access to grade-level, standards-based curricula rather than assessment issues.

Expanded Criteria and Increased Documentation

In recent years states have begun to consider more carefully the broader implications of their participation and accommodation policies. This study found changes made between 1999 and 2001 to the criteria used to make decisions about the participation of students with disabilities in state and district assessments and the provision of accommodations for indi-

vidual students. The number of states that base participation decisions at least partially on a student's emotional anxiety has increased, and decisions are now based more on an individual student's ability to participate in an assessment than on a student's disability category or placement. Moreover, parents are playing a bigger role in the participation and accommodation decision-making process.

Changes are also apparent in the documentation of specific accommodations. In general, states have increased the number of accommodations documented within their policies and have added more detailed specifications about which accommodations can be reported in aggregated data. The most controversial accommodations—read aloud, calculator, and scribe—have been more carefully defined and the conditions under which they are allowed or can be aggregated have been more explicitly stated in 2001 policies. States are increasingly indicating when the use of a specific accommodation will result in the score from the assessment not being included in aggregations.

Relationship Between Policy and Research

Policymakers generally agree that the primary purpose of assessment accommodations is to enable students with disabilities to access large-scale tests in meaningful ways. Policymakers also generally believe that the use of accommodations will permit tests to better measure the specific constructs being tested by enabling some students with disabilities who previously had been denied appropriate access to the test to participate in state assessments, but a general consensus across states about which accommodations should be used does not exist.

States also have continued to alter their accommodations policies despite the lack of a solid research base on the effects of individual accommodations. Numerous reviews of the accommodations research literature have pointed to the lack of conclusive findings and suggested ways that research can be improved (Sireci, Li, & Scarpati, n.d.; Thompson, Blount, & Thurlow, 2002; Thurlow & Bolt, 2001). Still, some generalizations can be stated. For example, the research on the read-aloud accommodation is inconclusive, but the research results generally indicate that test scores are more meaningful for students who received the needed accommodation than comparable scores for similar students who did not have access to the read-aloud accommodation (e.g., Calhoon, Fuchs, & Hamlett, 2000; Fuchs, Fuchs, Eaton, Hamlett, & Karns, 2000; Meloy, Deville, & Frisbie, 2000; Tindal, Heath, Hollenbeck, Almond, & Harniss, 1998; Tippetts & Michaels, 1997). Dictated response is another example of an accommodation lacking a strong empirical base. Research on the dictated response accommodation has been relatively limited and inconclusive (e.g., Fuchs et al., 2000; Koretz, 1997; MacArthur & Graham, 1987; Tippetts & Michaels, 1997; Trimble, 1998). Research on the extended time accommodation, one of the most widely re-

searched testing accommodations, also has produced mixed results (e.g., Centra, 1986; Fuchs et al., 2000; Lewis, Green, & Miller, 1999; Marquart, 2000; Munger & Loyd, 1991; Ziomek & Andrews, 1998).

According to Sireci et al. (n.d.), who conducted an extensive review of the accommodations literature for the National Research Council, accommodations have “positive, construct-valid effects” (p. 68), but three challenges remain:

1. Local education agencies need to learn how to implement accommodations appropriately;
2. more knowledge is needed about how to identify the appropriate accommodations for individual students; and
3. better tests should be designed to minimize the need for accommodations.

Accommodations for More Students

States have expanded their policies to include a larger population of students. Five states now have policies that indicate assessment accommodations can be used by any student in the state, not just those who have IEPs or 504 plans or who have limited English proficiency. Some states make certain accommodation categories available to all students, and several other states indicate that any student with a temporary disability has access to accommodations.

Conclusions

This investigation clearly shows that state policies continue to evolve. Changes in state participation and accommodation policies are not as dramatic as they were in the past. Instead the changes are slower and reflect a greater understanding of the details involved in the development of policies. Future analyses of states’ participation and accommodation policies are needed to provide detailed examinations of specific aspects of these policies, rather than a broad-sweep view such as this investigation. Conducting broad-sweep views of participation and accommodation policies makes sense only every 5 years or so, but this analysis provides a baseline for the future.

AUTHORS’ NOTE

The preparation of this article was supported, in part, by a cooperative agreement between the Research to Practice Division, Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education, and the University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Opinions or points of view expressed herein are those of the authors and not of the U.S. Department of Education.

REFERENCES

- Calhoun, M. B., Fuchs, L. S., & Hamlett, C. L. (2000). Effects of computer-based test accommodations on mathematics performance assessments for secondary students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 23, 271–282.
- Centra, J. A. (1986). Handicapped student performance on the Scholastic Aptitude Test. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 19(6), 324–327.
- Elliott, J., Erickson, R., Thurlow, M., & Shriner, J. (2000). State-level accountability for the performance of students with disabilities: Five years of change? *The Journal of Special Education*, 34(1), 39–47.
- Elliott, J. L., Thurlow, M. L., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Erickson, R. N. (1997). *Providing assessment accommodations for students with disabilities in state and district assessments* (Policy Directions 7). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Eaton, S. B., Hamlett, C., Binkley, E., & Crouch, R. (2000). Using objective data source to enhance teacher judgments about test accommodations. *Exceptional Children*, 67(1), 67–81.
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Eaton, S. B., Hamlett, C., & Karns, K. (2000). Supplementing teacher judgements about test accommodations with objective data sources. *School Psychology Review*, 29(1), 65–85.
- Huebert, J., & Hauser, R. (1999). *High stakes: Testing for tracking, promotion, and graduation*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Koretz, D. (1997). *The assessment of students with disabilities in Kentucky* (CSE Technical Report No. 431). Los Angeles: Center for Research on Standards and Student Testing.
- Krentz, J., Thurlow, M., Shyyan, V., & Scott, D. (2004). *Alternate routes to the standard diploma* (Synthesis Report). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Lehr, C., & Thurlow, M. (2003). *Putting it all together: Including students with disabilities in assessment and accountability systems* (Policy Directions No. 16). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved May 4, 2004, from <http://education.umn.edu/NCEO/OnlinePubs/Policy16.htm>
- Lewis, D., Green, D. R., & Miller, L. (1999, June). *Using differential item functioning analyses to assess the validity of testing accommodated students with disabilities*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Large-Scale Assessment, Snowbird, UT.
- MacArthur, C. A., & Graham, S. (1987). Learning disabled students’ composing under three methods of text production: Handwriting, word processing, and dictation. *The Journal of Special Education*, 21(3), 22–42.
- Marquart, A. (2000, June). *The use of extended time as an accommodation on a standardized mathematics test: An investigation of effects on scores and perceived consequences for students of various skill levels*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Council of the Chief State School Officers, Snowbird, UT.
- McDonnell, L., McLaughlin, M., & Morrison, P. (1997). *Educating one & all: Students with disabilities and standards-based reform*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- McGrew, K. S., Thurlow, M. L., & Spiegel, A. N. (1993). An investigation of the exclusion of students with disabilities in national data collection programs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15, 339–352.
- Meloy, L. L., Deville, C., & Frisbie, C. (2000, April). *The effect of a reading accommodation on standardized test scores of learning disabled and non-learning disabled students*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, New Orleans, LA.
- Munger, G. F., & Loyd, B. H. (1991). Effect of speededness on test performance of handicapped and nonhandicapped examinees. *Journal of Educational Research*, 85(1), 53–57.
- Quenemoen, R., Thompson, S., & Thurlow, M. (2003). *Measuring academic achievement of students with significant cognitive disabilities: Building understanding of alternate assessment scoring criteria* (Synthesis Report 50). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Sireci, S. G., Li, S., & Scarpati, S. (n.d.). *The effects of test accommodations: A review of the literature* (Research Report 485). Amherst: University of Massachusetts, Center for Educational Assessment.
- State Accountability for All Students Project. (2003). *Preliminary findings*. Columbus, OH: University of Dayton.

- Thompson, S., Blount, A., & Thurlow, M. (2002). *A summary of research on the effects of test accommodations: 1999 through 2001* (Technical Report 34). Minneapolis: National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Thompson, S., & Thurlow, M. (2001). *2001 state special education outcomes: A report on state activities at the beginning of a new decade*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Thurlow, M. (2002). Positive educational results for all students. *Remedial and Special Education*, 23(4), 195–202.
- Thurlow, M., & Bolt, S. (2001). *Empirical support for accommodations most often allowed in state policy* (Synthesis Report 41). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Thurlow, M., House, A., Boys, C., Scott, D., & Ysseldyke, J. (2000). *State participation and accommodation policies for students with disabilities: 1999 update* (Synthesis Report 33). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Thurlow, M., Lazarus, S., Thompson, S., & Robey, J. (2002). *2001 state policies on assessment participation and accommodations* (Synthesis Report 46). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Thurlow, M., Minnema, J., Bielinski, J., & Guven, K. (2003). *Testing students with disabilities out of level: State prevalence and performance results* (Out-of-Level Testing Project Report 9). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Thurlow, M. L., Scott, D. L., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1995a). *A compilation of states' guidelines for accommodations in assessments for students with disabilities* (Synthesis Report 18). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Thurlow, M. L., Scott, D. L., & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1995b). *A compilation of states' guidelines for including students with disabilities in assessments* (Synthesis Report 17). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Thurlow, M., Seyfarth, A., Scott, D., & Ysseldyke, J. (1997). *State assessment policies on participation and accommodations for students with disabilities: 1997 update* (Synthesis Report 29). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Thurlow, M. L., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Silverstein, B. (1993). *Testing accommodations for students with disabilities: A review of the literature* (Synthesis Report 4). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Tindal, G., Heath, B., Hollenbeck, K., Almond, P., & Harniss, M. (1998). Accommodating students with disabilities on large-scale tests: An empirical study of student response and test administration demands. *Exceptional Children*, 64(4), 439–450.
- Tippets, E., & Michaels, H. (1997, March). *Factor structure invariance of accommodated and non-accommodated performance assessments*. Paper presented at the National Council on Measurement in Education annual meeting, Chicago.
- Trimble, S. (1998). *Performance trends and use of accommodations on a statewide assessment* (Maryland/Kentucky Report Number 3). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.
- Ziomek, R. L., & Andrews, K. M. (1998). *ACT assessment score gains of special tested Students* (ACT Research Report Series). Iowa City, IA: ACT, Inc.